

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

L C BROWN,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 4:14-cv-04732-TLW
	)	
SGT C WEST, in his individual capacity,	)	
SCDC-Employee,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff L. C. Brown filed this pro se action in the Court of Common Pleas for Lee County, State of South Carolina. (Doc. #1-1). Defendant filed his Answer and Notice of Removal to this Court on December 15, 2014. (Doc. #1, 4). Defendant filed a motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, motion for summary judgment on May 11, 2015. (Doc. #15). Plaintiff filed a response in opposition on May 21, 2015 (Doc. #20), to which Defendant replied on June 8, 2015 (Doc. #26). Plaintiff filed a motion for default judgment on May 15, 2015 (Doc. #18), to which Plaintiff filed a response in opposition on June 1, 2015 (Doc. #25).

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court grant Defendant’s motion for summary judgment as to Plaintiff’s federal claim, decline to exercise jurisdiction over any state law claims that Plaintiff attempts to assert, and deny Plaintiff’s motion for default judgment. (Doc. #28).

Plaintiff's objections to the Report were due by July 2, 2015. Plaintiff failed to file objections, and this matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and concludes that it accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #28). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, Defendant's motion for summary judgment is hereby **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff's federal claim (Doc. #15), and any state law claims Plaintiff attempts to assert are hereby **DISMISSED**. Plaintiff's motion for default judgment is **DENIED**. (Doc. #18).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

July 9, 2015  
Columbia, South Carolina